While the Foreign Secretary was thoroughly English in his cautious empiricism more adventurous minds were thinking out lines of advance. How could the breathing space following the world war be used to construct new barriers against another catastrophe ? The idea of Locarno had come from Germany. The next scene was laid in America.

Two years after the entrance of Germany into the League, the signing of the Pact of Paris afforded fresh evidence of the desire to banish the spectre of war. The schemes of 1923 and 1924 had been scrapped, and the vacuum they attempted to fill remained. On April 6, 1927, the tenth anniversary of the entry of the United States into the struggle, Briand proposed to the American people a mutual engagement to outlaw war for a hundred years. Since the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy was already familiar from the Covenant and the Locarno Pact it attracted little notice, and indeed such a declaration of confidence and goodwill on the part of two old friends would have been scarcely more than a *beau geste.* Professor Murray Butler urged acceptance in a letter in the *New York Times* of April 25, and Professor Shotwell of Columbia drafted an unofficial treaty to which any country could adhere. Why should not all states renounce war, not only fox a century but for ever ? The Quai d'Orsay was not enamoured of the proposed extension, and on June 3 it formally suggested a treaty of peace, between France and the United States. After a long delay, during which American opinion was being tested, Kellogg replied on December 28, proposing that all states should renounce war as an instrument of national policy. Briand accepted the invitation to join the United States in presenting a draft treaty after signing it them-

selves. The American project, however, so different from Briand's original offer, aroused no enthusiasm among the French, who feared the weakening of existing obligations and deplored the absence of sanctions.

Apprehensions were diminished by Kellogg's formal declaration in an address to the American Society of International Law on April 28 that the signatories were not debarred from the right to defend themselves against unprovoked attack. Any violation of the pact, he added, would automatically release the other parties from their obligations to the treaty-breaking state. This merely stated what everyone took for granted, and since it is the practice of belligerents to assert that they are fighting in self-defence, the reservation reduced